



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,914	08/18/2003	Liexiang Fan	2003P08.374US	3652
7590	10/17/2008		EXAMINER	
Siemens Corporation Intellectual Property Department 170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830			KIM, CHONO R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Continuation of 11:

Applicants essentially argue that their claimed invention differs from the prior art because "Kawaguchi, et al., calculate a difference between a current input signal and a reference value" and therefore, "Kawaguchi, et al. do not calculate a positional change in the parameter between images." (Response, p. 3). The Examiner disagrees.

First, the Examiner would like to point out that Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "Admission") by itself is sufficient to disclose all the features recited in claim 1. For example, Admission discloses determining a rate of change of a parameter as a function of a difference in time between first and second images associated with different times, the first and second images representing a scanned region of a patient [pars. 2-3. Note that the flow direction and magnitude are determined.]; calculating a positional change in the parameter between the first and second images associated with different times, the positional change being displayed as a function the rate of change and being a function of the difference in time [par. 3. Note that obtaining a two-dimensional vector by "determining a correlation in the speckle at translated positions between images" is construed as determining a positional change in the parameter.]; and displaying the change in the parameter in the second image [par. 3. Note that the change in the parameter is displayed in the second image as changes in brightness and color.]. Because Admission discloses the features recited in claim 1, the combination of Admission and Kawaguchi also disclose the features recited in claim 1. See *In re Kalm*, 378 F.2d 959, 962 (holding that anticipation is the epitome of obviousness).

Second, in response to Applicants' argument that Kawaguchi does not disclose calculating a positional change in the parameter between images, it appears that Applicants have

ignored the teachings of Admission, and failed to appreciate how the two prior art references are combined. The Examiner notes that combining Admission with Kawaguchi provides the added benefit of displaying the flow information as a shift in a synthesized pattern, rather than merely changes in color. Kawaguchi explains that a synthesized pattern is shifted according to flow direction (polarity) and magnitude data. (Kawaguchi, col. 5, ll. 16-36 and fig. 3). In combining Admission with Kawaguchi, one of ordinary skill would have realized that in order to properly display the flow between Admission's two images, the flow direction and magnitude data from Admission would have to have been used to generate the shift pattern of Kawaguchi. To do otherwise would not have made any sense, since using Kawaguchi's flow direction and magnitude data to generate his own shifted pattern is essentially what Kawaguchi alone teaches, not what the combination teaches.

For at least the reasons above, Applicants arguments are unpersuasive.

/CHARLES KIM/
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2624
chongr.kim@uspto.gov